1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

LARRY BUCK,

          Plaintiff,

   v.

KIM BROWER, JAMES ROHDE and DEBBIE GAYNOR,

          Defendants.

Case No. 13-cv-04084 NC

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY CASE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED

     On September 11, 2013, defendants Kim Brower, James Rohde, and Debbie Gaynor filed a motion to dismiss pro se plaintiff Larry Buck's complaint. Dkt. No. 4. Civil Local Rule 7-3(a) requires parties to file and serve an opposition within fourteen days after a motion is filed. In the alternative, a party who does not oppose the motion must file a statement of nonopposition with the Court within fourteen days. Civ. L.R. 7-3(b). Where, as in this case, the motion was not served through the Court's Electronic Case Filing (ECF) system, *see* Dkt. No. 4-3, these deadlines are extended by 3 days. Civ. L.R. 7-3(a). Accordingly, Buck's response to defendants' motion was due by September 30, 2013. Buck has not filed a response. "Failure to follow a district court's local rules is a proper ground for dismissal." *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Accordingly,

1   Buck has until October 11, 2013, to oppose defendants' motion to dismiss (or file a

2   statement of nonopposition) and to show cause why this action should not be dismissed.

3   Buck's failure to respond will result in dismissal of this case with prejudice.

4   Buck must also consent or decline the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge by October

5   11, 2013. See attached consent/declination forms.

6   IT IS SO ORDERED.

7   Date: October 1, 2013

8   Nathanael M. Cousins
                                                        United States Magistrate Judge

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28